

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

OSCAR NAVACARMONA,

Defendant and Appellant.

B262356

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. NA099670)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,  
Jesse I. Rodriguez, Judge. Affirmed.

Mark S. Givens, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant  
and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

---

On July 12, 2014, appellant was involved in a hit-and-run incident. He had rear-ended another vehicle, and then attempted to drive away. The other driver pursued him, and appellant drove into a cul-de-sac. He escaped the cul-de-sac by running into the other vehicle.

Appellant was charged with one count of hit-and-run driving (Veh. Code, § 20002, subd. (a)), three counts of assault with a deadly weapon, a vehicle (Pen. Code, § 245, subd. (a)(1)), one count of misdemeanor drug possession, and one count of felony vandalism. As part of a plea bargain, on December 16, 2014, appellant pled no contest to the drug possession and felony vandalism charges. The remaining charges were dismissed. The trial court sentenced appellant to three years in county jail for the felony vandalism, and imposed various fines and fees. Appellant also was ordered to pay \$12,009.64 in victim restitution. Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal.

After examining the record, appointed appellate counsel filed a brief raising no issues, but asking this court to independently review the record on appeal pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442. (See *Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 264.) On July 31, 2015, we advised appellant he had 30 days within which to submit by brief or letter any contentions or argument he wished this court to consider. No response was received.

This court has examined the entire record in accordance with *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at pages 441-442, and is satisfied appellant's attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel, and no arguable issues exist. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of conviction.

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.**

MANELLA, J.

We concur:

EPSTEIN, P. J.

COLLINS, J.